

REMARKS

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Final Office Action mailed August 25, 2006. A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Final Office Action mailed August 25, 2006, Claims 1-8 and 10-14 were pending in the Application. In the Final Office Action, Claims 1, 2, and 12-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Martin, Jr., et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,610,105, hereinafter Martin). Claims 3-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of De Boor et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,204, hereinafter De Boor). Claims 10 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin in view of Buckham et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,016, hereinafter Buckham). Claims 11 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Boor in view of Buckham.

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Response amends Claims 4, 5, 6, and 8, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-8 and 10-14. Reconsideration of the Application and of the claims in light of the following arguments is respectfully requested.

III. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 2 and 12-14 were rejected under U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Martin, Jr., et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,610,105). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1

Martin discloses a method and system for providing resource access in a mobile environment. A central content server is able to return requested content to requestors in a format suitable for their device, such a mobile devices. (col. 2, lines 34-36 and 41-42). Martin discloses a *plurality of links* to available services but does not specifically disclose how these

links are determined. (col. 3, lines 33-34). Martin further discloses a *list of hyperlinks*. In Fig. 3B, the list includes nine items, each item represents a category of content, such as “Finance,” “News/sports,” and “Travel.” (col. 9, lines 16-19). These hyperlinks are desired or frequently visited sites, for example. (col. 8, lines 19-20).

Claim 1 is an independent claim that requires detecting a content portion from the Web page data” and “searching the content portion to identify one or more *Web content data items*, wherein each of the one or more web content data items included in the content portion can be *accessed via at least one link indication* to provide a service from a mobile device through a wireless connection. “Web content data items” are *data that can be found in the content portion of an accessed web page*, such as a telephone number, an address and an email address. New links, or “at least one link indication,” are provided for these Web content data items. These new links provide a service from the mobile device through a wireless connection. For example, telephone number links are provided to the mobile device display, and the telephone number links may be accessed to dial the listed number. As another example, new links to addresses are provided to the display allowing addresses to be accessed along with a map for locating the address for the user’s convenience. As a further example, new links to email addresses are provided to the display. When accessed these email links allow the user to send an email to the displayed email address. (Spec., p. 8, lines 20-24, 26-30 and p. 9 lines 1-2).

In Martin, on the other hand, the plurality of links to “available services” suggests a set of links predetermined by the system software and displayed to the mobile device. Similarly, the list of hyperlinks in Martin is either predetermined by the system software, desired/selected by the user or sites frequently visited by the user. Martin does not search the content portion of web pages to identify these categories for this list of links. More specifically, Martin does not perform “searching the content portion to identify one or more Web content data items, wherein each of the one or more web content data items included in the content portion can be accessed via at least one link indication to provide a service from a mobile device through a wireless connection,” as required by claim 1. For at least these reasons, claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 2 and 12-14

Claims 2 and 12-14 each depend from claim 1 and are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 2 and 12-14 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

IV. Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 3-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Jr., et al., in view of De Boor, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,675,204).

Claim 3

De Boor discloses a wireless communication device with markup language based man-machine interface. De Boor discloses that a phone book object stores records of names, associated *telephone numbers, addresses, email addresses*, etc. on a web browser 107, separate from the wireless communication device 100. (Fig. 1 and col. 13, lines 28-30).

Claim 3 depends from claim 1 requires that one or more Web content data items is a *telephone number*. The telephone numbers stored on Web browser as disclosed in De Boor is not the same as telephone numbers found on a currently accessed web page. Thus, De Boor does not disclose that one or more Web content data items is a telephone number. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 3 is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 4

Claim 4 depends from claim 2. Claim 4 has been amended to be more accurate, and thus has only been reworded to require that “when the at least one link indication is activated, the telephone number is dialed.” Applicants respectfully submit that *no new matter is being added* to this claim. Claim 4 is otherwise not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that this claim is allowable in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit

that Claim 4 is similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that this claim also add its own limitations which render it patentable in its own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claim 5

Claim 5 depends from claim 1. Claim 5 as amended requires that one or more Web content data items is an *address*. This claim has been amended to correct “address number,” which was in error. As discussed above, “addresses,” not just address numbers, within the Web page are provided to the display. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that *no new matter is being added* to this claim. Further, the comments provided above with respect to claim 3 are hereby incorporated by reference. As discussed above for claim 3, the addresses stored on the Web browser as disclosed in De Boor is not the same as addresses found on a currently accessed web page. Thus, De Boor does not disclose one or more Web content data items is an address. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 7

Claim 7 depends from claim 1. Claim 7 requires that one or more Web content data items is an *email address*. The comments provided above with respect to claim 3 are hereby incorporated by reference. As discussed above for claim 3, the email addresses stored on the Web browser as disclosed in De Boor is not the same as email addresses found on a currently accessed web page. Thus, De Boor does not disclose one or more Web content data items is an email address. For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 7 is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 10 and 6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, Jr., et al., in view of Buckham, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,662,016).

Claim 10

Buckham discloses providing graphical location information for mobile resources using a data-enabled network. Such resource locations include the *location of an individual, a car, truck or other vehicle* using a PDA or wireless telephone. Applications that make use of such location information are fleet management applications or applications for providing driving directions. (col. 1, lines 14-24).

Claim 10 is an independent claim that requires identifying at least one address from the one or more Web content data items in the content portion of the Web page data file. The comments provided above with respect to claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. The location of a resource such as an individual, car, truck, or other vehicle as disclosed in Buckham is not the same as identifying at least one address found from a currently accessed Web page. Thus, Buckham does not disclose identifying at least one address from the one or more Web content data items in the content portion of the Web page data file, as required by claim 10. For at least this reason and for similar reasons as provided above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 6

Claim 6 depends from claim 2. Claim 6 has been amended to be more accurate, and thus has only been reworded to require that “when the at least one link indication is activated, map data is obtained to show the location for the address.” Applicants respectfully submit that *no new matter is being added* to this claim. Claim 6 is otherwise not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that this claim is allowable in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 6 is similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that this claim also add its own limitations which render it patentable in its own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 11 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over De Boor in view of Buckham.

Claim 11

Claim 11 is an independent claim that requires identifying at least one email address from one or more Web content data items in the content portion of the Web page data file. Applicants believe that the Examiner meant to reject this claim as being unpatentable over Martin, in view of De Boor and further in view of Buckham. The comments provided above with respect to claims 1, 7 and 10 are hereby incorporated by reference. The location of a resource such as an individual, car, truck, or other vehicle as disclosed in Buckham is not the same as identifying at least one email address found from a currently accessed Web page. Further, the email addresses stored on the Web browser as disclosed in De Boor is not the same as email addresses found on a currently accessed web page. Thus, neither Buckham nor De Boor discloses identifying at least one email address from the one or more Web content data items in the content portion of the Web page data file, as required by claim 12. For at least these reasons and for similar reasons as provided above with respect to claims 1, 7 and 10, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 11 is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 8

Claim 8 depends from claim 2. Claim 8 has been amended to be more accurate, and thus has only been reworded to require that “when the at least one link indication is activated, an email to the email address is initiated.” Applicants respectfully submit that *no new matter is being added* to this claim. Claim 8 is otherwise not addressed separately but it is respectfully submitted that this claim is allowable in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 8 is similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also submitted that this claim also add its own limitations which render it patentable in its own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

V. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned before an advisory action is issued in order to avoid any unnecessary filing of an appeal.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for the time to respond up to and including December 25, 2006.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 22, 2006

By: /Julie Daniels Missud/

Julie Daniels Missud
Reg. No. 51,330

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Customer No. 23910